

Date: Wed, 16 Mar 94 04:30:20 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #134  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 16 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 134

Today's Topics:

                    Coord. priority for open repeaters  
Religion Whiners (was: Misattribution Whiners (was: Morse Whiners))

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 16 Mar 1994 00:52:24 GMT  
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Coord. priority for open repeaters  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:  
>Since the FCC recently said that repeater trustees can "ban" operators from  
>using their machines, in effect the FCC has ruled that all repeaters are,  
>in fact, "closed".

This is not recent.

This has ALWAYS been the case, ever since repeaters were recognized in  
the USA amateur rules.

What astonishes me is that there are actually hams out there who thought  
it was ever any other way!

You have NEVER had the automatic right to operate through any specific  
repeater. It has ALWAYS been at the repeater licensee's discretion.

The recent FCC letter simply restates what has ALWAYS been the rule.  
Whether you knew it or not is irrelevant.

Clear?

- Brian

-----  
Date: 15 Mar 1994 22:51:21 GMT  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!  
yeshua.marcam.com!charnel!olivea!korie1!male.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!  
engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Religion Whiners (was: Misattribution Whiners (was: Morse Whiners)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CMP11z.2yu@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey  
Herman) writes:

>And of course I do not think discrimination on the basis of religion is  
>alright. But you can't very well compare amateur licensing and religion,  
>so your question is moot [for the second time].

This thread originally started when someone, sorry I don't remember who,  
said (correctly, I believe) that making judgements about peoples' behavior  
and character based on their class of license is the kind of prejudice that  
leads to racism. You objected to comparing license-class bigotry to racism.  
I think we agree that on a scale of evils, license-class bigotry hardly  
ranks with racism or religious prejudice. Despite the difference in scale,  
they are based on the same sort of habits of thought. You then went on to  
claim that the reason racism was bad, but license-class bigotry wasn't, was  
because one's race could not be changed but one's license class could.  
That's when I brought up religion. Religion is a personal characteristic  
that one could change, but intolerance of religion is widely considered evil  
in our society.

So, what is different about class of license that makes it OK for one to  
make snap judgements of entire groups of people based only on it? I think  
my religion example, though admittedly hyperbolic, establishes that it's not  
whether a characteristic is voluntarily changeable. It's not that class of  
license is such a trivial characteristic that its only a matter of taste --  
we don't see people on here whining about the "four-eyes" on their repeater,  
or the "Dallas Cowboys fans"; obviously several people think it's darn  
important. Why is it OK to write somebody off as a "no-clue" because they  
haven't passed Element 1a? (Or 1b, or 1c, wherever the magic line that  
confers full humanity is.)

Rich

[Yes, the last parenthetical remark was hyperbole again... I'll try to work synecdoche and metonymy into the \*next\* post.]

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----  
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 14:01:48 GMT  
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar14.044458.3410@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,  
<1994Mar14.182516.8742@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<CSLE87-140394165910@145.1.114.19>  
Subject : Portable ID legal (was: Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters)

Karl Beckman (CSLE87) wrote:

: >

: > George Lyle, N7TNJ/6

: Two other small points, George: First, would you consider modifying your  
: user data so that your real name appears instead of #233789? Second, why  
: are you using the /6 on your call? If you have established full legal  
: residence in CA you are no longer portable, and if you sent the proper  
: legal change of address notice to the FCC you are required to use your  
: issued callsign without the /6. On the other hand, maybe you are only a  
: temporary resident and pay your taxes from a 7-land address instead of CA.

"Required"? Wherever did you get this idea? This isn't in the rules  
at all. See 97.119c.

(Besides, for my part, I don't have a station location anymore, so  
it's hard to tell whether I'm portable or not! Plus, there is no  
requirement at all that your mailing address be your legal residence,  
or anywhere else for that matter, only that the US Postal Service  
delivers mail to it and that you answer any FCC mail that arrives  
there.)

-drt, KG2S/1

-----  
David R. Tucker KG2S           drt@world.std.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 16:06:43 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!

europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar14.182516.8742@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<CSLE87-140394165910@145.1.114.19>, <CMpLn2.45F@world.std.com>  
Subject : Re: Portable ID legal (was: Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters)

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>Karl Beckman (CSLE87) wrote:

>: >

>: > George Lyle, N7TNJ/6

>: [...] Second, why

>: are you using the /6 on your call? If you have established full legal  
>: residence in CA you are no longer portable, and if you sent the proper  
>: legal change of address notice to the FCC you are required to use your  
>: issued callsign without the /6. On the other hand, maybe you are only a  
>: temporary resident and pay your taxes from a 7-land address instead of CA.

>"Required"? Wherever did you get this idea? This isn't in the rules  
>at all. See 97.119c.

David is absolutely correct. That is, for identification over the  
air. But it seems to me that, while Karl's comment about the "stroke  
six" is pedantic at best, and anal-retentive at worst, it really has  
nothing to do with how he identifies himself on the internet.

Dave Hiram Percy Bushong, W1AW

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

-----  
Date: Mon, 14 Mar 1994 21:23:00 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar9.111758.4665@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CMMI2w.170@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Mar14.152035.2910@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <1994Mar14.152035.2910@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary  
Coffman) writes:

>In article <CMMI2w.170@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey  
Herman) writes:

>>In article <1994Mar9.111758.4665@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary  
Coffman) writes:

>>>In article <CME13w.CAJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:  
>>>>So, since it's possible to change one's religion, you think discrimination  
>>>>on basis of religion is OK?  
>>  
>>Gary, do be more careful with the attribution lines - I didn't write the  
>>above.  
>>  
>>Jeff NH6IL  
>  
>Jeff, do be more careful in \*editing\* posts. Here's the original below.  
>  
>-----  
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy  
>Path: ke4zv!gary  
>>From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
>Subject: Re: Morse Whiners  
>Message-ID: <1994Mar9.111758.4665@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
>Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
>Organization: Destructive Testing Systems  
>References: <CM2A9p.Cq3@world.std.com> <CM8JKo.Hq6@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
><RFM.94Mar8101744@urth.eng.sun.com> <CME13w.CAJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
>Date: Wed, 9 Mar 1994 11:17:58 GMT  
>Lines: 19  
>  
>In article <CME13w.CAJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:  
>>>So, since it's possible to change one's religion, you think discrimination  
>>>on basis of religion is OK?  
>>>  
>>>Rich  
>>Besides, to what would you 'upgrade' your religion?  
>  
>Actually, in many communities of a few decades ago, upgrading of  
>religion was frequently done. Pentecostals, Free Will Baptists,  
>and Methodists often upgraded to Presbyterian or Episcopal as  
>their economic and social status changed.  
>  
>Gary  
>-----  
>Notice that you edited off the signature of "Rich" who made the original  
>comment in your current missive, as well as editing off \*his\* attribution  
>line in your original post. So I \*couldn't\* include it in my reply to you.

\*I\* did not edit off \*his\* attribution line. I never remove attribution lines, but I do remove signatures to save 'bandwidth' and because they are redundant. Re-examine the above and you'll see you've made it look as if I stated ``So, since it's ....''. You could have added ``Rich writes: '' to

avoid any confusion.

Ah, forget it!

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 22:00:17 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-080394101127@129.188.192.107>, <CMFKpE.I5n@world.std.com>,  
<10MAR199416431644@jane.uh.edu> p  
Subject : Re: How can I \*LEGALLY\* change my Ham radio to send/receive Marine B

In article <10MAR199416431644@jane.uh.edu> st3qi@jane.uh.edu (Killebrew, Brad A.)  
writes:

>  
>Here's the poop:  
>  
>The rule in question is title 47, part 97, section 403.  
>  
>\$97.403 Safety of life and protection of property  
>  
> "No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur  
> station of any means of radiocommunications at its disposal  
> to provide essential communication needs in connection with  
> the immediate safety of human life and immediate protection  
> of property when normal communication systems are not available"  
>  
>Based on this rule, I do not believe that the guy is guilty of anything.  
>In my opinion, he has complied with the rules that govern the radio service  
>he is licensed for -- amateur radio.  
>  
>I think the only reason that he got in trouble is because the sheriff was  
>affended that an 'amateur' with some two-bit radio could communicate on  
>the 'police' repeater -- like it's supposed to be some kind of 'secure'  
>radio system that only the police are allowed to communicate on!  
>  
>Of course, I don't know 100% of the facts in the story, but we'll see  
>what happens to the kid.

It wasn't just the sheriff that was offended but the FCC, too.

Someone correct me if I'm wrong (why do I even say that?) but didn't  
the city (or county) authorities just recently order the sheriff's office  
to return the radio to the owner?

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 06:37:11 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar9.111758.4665@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CMMI2w.170@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <RFM.94Mar14114407@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject : Religion Whiners (was: Misattribution Whiners (was: Morse Whiners))

In article <RFM.94Mar14114407@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>In article <CMMI2w.170@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>

>>In article <1994Mar9.111758.4665@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>

>>>In article <CME13w.CAJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>>>So, since it's possible to change one's religion, you think discrimination  
>>>>on basis of religion is OK?

>>

>>Gary, do be more careful with the attribution lines - I didn't write the  
>>above.

>>

>>Jeff NH6IL

>

>Let's look at what Gary actually included in his post, but Jeff left  
>out in his haste to whine about misattribution:

>

>-- start of excerpt --

>In article <CME13w.CAJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>>So, since it's possible to change one's religion, you think discrimination  
>>>on basis of religion is OK?

>>>

>>>Rich

>

>>Besides, to what would you 'upgrade' your religion?

>-- end of excerpt --

>

>Note that the part I wrote is still signed, rather unambiguously, "Rich".

>I also note that you never did answer the question...

As I said I ALWAYS delete the sig but NEVER the attribution. Look at the above - it looks as if Gary has attributed your question to me.

Just be more careful, huh?

And of course I do not think discrimination on the basis of religion is alright. But you can't very well compare amateur licensing and religion, so your question is moot [for the second time]. We don't need a religious debate on .policy; it seems that you're trying to lay the bait for one, though.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 22:22:40 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar9.103603.4261@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CMFqx3.64z@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Mar10.171624.12271@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <1994Mar10.171624.12271@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CMFqx3.64z@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>In article <1994Mar9.103603.4261@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>>No one is \*owed\* respect, they have to \*earn\* the respect of their fellows  
>>>\*every day\*. Some older hams have not earned that respect due to their  
>>>behavior towards others. The same could, of course, be said about some  
>>>newer hams, but at least they have the excuse of youth and inexperience.  
>>

>> I think that's a very arrogant view. Someone who has gained a lifetime  
>>of knowledge in their field has already earned my respect whether it  
>>be a medical researcher, professor, astronaut, and yes even an older  
>>ham. The senior members of our hobby have a wealth of knowledge to share  
>>and I respect them for that. And I respect that they are entitled to speak  
>>their opinions.

>

>How about an elder assassin, or the old Grand Kleagle of the Klu Klux  
>Klan? Do they deserve your respect too? Time in grade is no measure of  
>ability, knowledge, or accomplishment, though I'm sure the Grand Kleagle  
>is an expert at intimidation and race baiting. But does he hold interesting  
>QSOs on the 2 meter machine, and does he help newcomers to learn how to  
>properly burn a cross? Those are the proper measures to judge him, not just  
>on his past exploits at church bombings.



Wow, Gary - you really take a topic to the extreme edge! I guess if I was a young-pup assassin I WOULD look up to the senior assassins.

I'm not advocating blind respect for someone irregardless of their actions; I'll respect someone for their knowledge but if they conduct themselves in a manner I find offensive I will quickly lose respect for them.

>>And as I recall you're one of the persons who has been making fun  
>>of some QSOs between the older folks you've heard on the air; You're not  
>>setting a very good example for the newer hams.

>

>And I'll continue to ridicule poor practices, without discrimination based  
>on age. I'm an equal opportunity sort of guy. :-)

And that's very good. But please don't ridicule the seniors just because their QSOs are boring; after all, we'll probably all have hemorrhoidal problems eventually...

Jeff NH6IL

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #134

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*